

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/494,897	01/31/2000	Timothy E. Dickson	2400-384 4099	
27820	7590 10/31/2003		EXAMINER	
WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.			VON BUHR, MARIA N	
P.O. BOX 1287 CARY, NC 27512			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	2125	17[
			DATE MAILED: 10/31/2003	17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	<i>!</i>	(X
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/494,897	DICKSON, TIMOTHY E.
•	Examiner	Art Unit
	Maria N. Von Buhr	2125
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS API Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	 a timely filed amendment which 	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR R	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the maili b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). Th fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date o (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Of timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forthe later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing SILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount of the shortened statutory period for reply fice later than three months after the ma	ng date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP FR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension out of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	pecause:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	ner consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see Note	below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cance NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	ction(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	d be allowable if submitted in a so	eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Second in the seco	r reconsideration has been cons ee Continuation Sheet.	idered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	o issues which were newly
 For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w 	nt(s) a) will not be entered or b rould be rejected is provided belo)□ will be entered and an ow or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		•
Claim(s) rejected:		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	

Maria N. Von Buhr Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2125

10. Other: ____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

As to the first point, that "the Myers et al. reference is commonly owned with the present application," the statement presented by Applicant is insufficient to overcome the rejection. This rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR §1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR §1.131.

As to the second point, that "Myers et al. is not comparing fuel flow rates per se. Myers et al. is comparing a pulse stream indicative of a fuel flow rate or a number of pulses in a pulse stream. The pulse stream is not an amount of fuel alleged to be dispensed, but rather is a pulse stream. This pulse stream can be used to derive an amount of fuel alleged to be dispensed, but under the strict scutiny required in an anticipation analysis, the pulse stream is not an amount of fuel alleged to be dispensed," Applicant's argument is not persuasive. Upon further consideration, after the interview on 07 August 2003, as described in Paper No. 12, Examiner deems that the pulse stream of Myers et al. IS an amount of fuel alleged to be dispensed, albeit in a different unit of measure from customary gallons or liters. In this regard, Myers et al. specifically assert "generating a digital pulse stream INDICATIVE OF THE VOLUME AND FLOW RATE OF FUEL DISPENSED" (see at least the abstract; emphasis added). Hence, the rejection stands.